UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,361	06/07/2001	Matthew R. Labarge	60001.0044US01/MS#154687.	9164

7590 10/01/2007

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
SPOONER, LAMONT M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/876,361	LABARGE, MATTHEW R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lamont M. Spooner	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 July 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *6/7/01* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/24/07 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 7/24/07, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-23 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Lakritz (US 6,526,426) in view of Lissauer (US 6,466,900) and further in view of Greco et al. (6,804,705).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 7, 10, 11, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz (US 6,526,426) in view of Lissauer (US 6,466,900).

As per **claim 10, 1, 17, and 18**, Greco teaches a method for submitting a document for translation services, comprising the steps of:

receiving edits on a word processor for a pre-translated document non-HTML docmument (C.4.lines 6-12-his Microsoft Word-document, C.4 lines 59, 60), wherein the edits include at least one member of a group comprising the addition of text, formatting, and a non-text entry to the pre-translated document (ibid, his document creation and image);

receiving a request on the word processor application to translate the pre-translated document from a first language to a second language (Fig. 5B-his translate menu option);

receiving a list of translation services for translating a document from a first language to a second languages (Fig. 4 item 430, C.9 lines 19-25-his menu options, C.8 lines 1-5-his menu)

selecting a translation service from a list of services for translating the pre-translated document from the first language to the second language (Fig. 4 item 430, C.9 lines 19-25);

requesting an identification for the selected translation service (ibid-his secure location of a translation service, inherently required an identification for the selected service);

saving the pre-translated document, including the non-text entry from the pre-translated document, to a temporary storage medium (C.9 lines 1-5);

creating a saved document from the pre-translated document in a format for submitting to the selected translation service (ibid-his electronic provided document to the service provider-requiring a saved version for electronic submission of a document from Word to a translation service), launching an instance of a web browser from the word processor; and submitting the saved document, through the web browser, to the selected translation service via the identification for the selected translation service.

receiving the translated document from the selected translation service (C.9 lines 23-26); and displaying the translated document (C.9 lines 23-26, Fig. 2 item 270-his output/display).

Greco lacks the saved document including the formatting and including a path to the non-text entry saved in the temporary storage medium, instead of the saved document including the non-text entry;

However, Lissauer teaches the lacking elements, saving path...instead..., (C.4.lines 15-29-"it only stores the path ..."). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Greco's stored document by storing only the paths to non-text entry (entries). The motivation for doing so would have been to save memory space.

The combination of Greco and Lissauer does not teach saving the pre-translated document as an HTML document, sending the HTML document...translation service, receiving a translated HTML document..., displaying the translated HTML document. However, the Examiner takes official notice that having HTML as a method for marking a language for transmission over the Internet was well known at the time of the invention (Microsoft Word 2000 contains "Save As HTML" option). Bourbonnais teaches translation services requiring HTML formatting of document for translation (C.7 lines 15-30-his supported formats for translation as HTML). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Greco and Lissauer

with Bourbannais' requested HTML format having a saved document as a HTML formatted document for translation and presentation/display to the user, providing the benefit of a known format for electronic online document transmission for translation and reception by an interface/browser.

As per **claim 2**, Greco teaches the method of Claim 1, further comprising the steps of: at the selected translation service, creating a translated document by translating the saved document from the first language to the second language (C.9 lines 23-26); receiving the translated document from the selected translation service (C.9 lines 23-26); and displaying the translated document (C.9 lines 23-26, Fig. 2 item 270-his output/display).

As per **claims 11, 3 and 19**, Greco, Lissauer and Bourbonnais make obvious dependent claims 10 and 1. Greco and Lissauer lacks teaching explicitly the step of displaying the translated HTML document further comprises the steps of:

using the path to the non-text entry (entries) saved in the translated HTML document to call the non-text entry (entries); and

displaying the translated HTML document with the non-text entry (entries) and the formatting of the pre-translated document

However, Borbonnais teaches using the path to the entries saved in the translated HTML document to call the non-text entry (entries); and displaying the translated HTML document with the non-text entry (entries) and the formatting of the pre-translated document (C.7 lines 22-30-inherent to his preserving the original format for return and display to the user).Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Greco with Lissauer's non-text entry paths, with Borbonnais preservation of original formatting for translation, thus providing presentation of translated text and non-text entries to the user in the original format.

As per **claims 4 and 20**, Greco, Lissauer and Bourbonnais make obvious dependent claim 1, and Greco further teaches wherein the step of submitting the saved document to the selected translation service, further comprises:

sending the saved document to the selected translation service at a remote translation server via a distributed computing environment (Fig. 1 item 120-his server, and selected translation service-see claim 1).

As per **claim 5**, Greco, Lissauer and Bourbonnais make obvious dependent claim 1, and Greco further discloses:

prior to the step of selecting a translation service from the list of translation services, further comprising the step of:

receiving a list of translation services (see claim 1, selection...list of services inherently requires receiving a list prior to...); and maintaining the list of translation services in a system registry (see claim 1-his menu of services as the registry).

As per **claim 7**, Greco, Lissauer and Bourbonnais make obvious dependent claim 1, and the combination further discloses wherein the step of creating a saved document, further comprises the step of:

The combination of Greco and Lissauer does not teach saving the pre-translated document in HTML format, including HTML tags defining the formatting of the pre-translated document (ibid) and HTML tags pointing to the non-text entry saved in the temporary storage medium

However, the Examiner takes official notice that saving a document in HTML format was well known at the time of the invention (Microsoft Word 2000 contains "Save As HTML" option) and having HTML as a method for marking a language for transmission over the Internet was well known at the time of the invention. Bourbonnais teaches translation services requiring HTML formatting of document for translation (C.7 lines 15-30-his

supported formats for translation as HTML, and HTML tags). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Greco's translation service and Lissauer's tag and pointing with Bourbannais' requested HTML format having a saved document as a HTML formatted document for translation and presentation/display to the user, providing the benefit of a known format for electronic online document transmission for translation and reception by an interface/browser.

5. Claims 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greco in view of Lissauer and further in view of Bourbonnais, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP, HTTP-1.0, 1996).

As per **claims 6 and 21**, Greco, Lissauer and Bourbonnais make obvious dependent claim 1, and the above combination lack explicitly teaching wherein the step of requesting an identification for the selected translation service includes the steps of:

requesting a uniform resource locator (URL) for the selected translation service, including sending an HTTP GET request for the URL.

However, HTTP teaches requesting a uniform resource locator (URL) for the service, including sending an HTTP GET request for the URL

(his HTTP GET request for URL, being standard for requesting a universal resource for a service provided online, section 8-see HTTP GET discussion-Section 1-his WWW discussion).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Greco, Lissauer and Bourbonnais online translation service request with an HTTP GET request for a URL providing the service, with a motivation of using a well known protocol for producing desired information from an online source.

As per **claims 8 and 22**, Greco, Lissauer and Bourbonnais make obvious dependent claim 1. The above combination lacks explicitly teaching wherein the step of submitting the saved document to the selected translation service, further comprises the step of:

sending to the selected translation service an HTTP POST request containing parameters associated with the translation service and containing the saved document.

However, HTTP teaches sending to a service an HTTP POST request containing parameters associated with a service (section 8-his

HTTP POST-providing a block of data to a data handling process). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Greco, Lissauer and Bourbonnais online translation service request with an HTTP POST request to a translation service, with a motivation of using a well known protocol for transmitting desired information to an online source.

As per **claims 9 and 23**, Greco, Lissauer and Bourbonnais make obvious dependent claim 8. The above combination lacks explicitly teaching wherein the step of sending to the selected translation service an HTTP POST request, further comprises the step of:

sending the HTTP POST request via an Internet browser across a distributed computing environment whereby the selected translation service is resident in a remote translation server.

However, HTTP POST teaches sending the HTTP POST request (ibid) via an Internet browser (Fig. 1 item-his client device and server, see claim 1 for online translation service, C.4 lines 25-35) across a distributed computing environment whereby the selected translation service is resident in a remote translation server (ibid of claim 4 above, wherein the translation

resources which performs the translation interpreted as the translation server, is remote).

As per **claim 12**, Greco teaches a method of communicating between a client process and a server process in a distributed processing system for providing remote processing, comprising the steps of:

issuing from a word processor (see claim 1), by the client process (see claim 1), a request call having a plurality of call parameters, comprising a translation service identifier (see claim 1), a "from" language identifier and a "to" language identifier (see claim 1-his translation to a language)

receiving at the word processor, by a first server process, the parameters (ibid, his translation service provider, to and from language),

issuing from the word processor (see claim 1-wherein the processes are issued from the word processor, his Microsoft Word for example), by the first server process,

launching from the word processor an instance of a web browser (see claim 1)

but lacks explicitly issuing, by the client process, an HTTP GET request call having a plurality of call parameters, comprising a translation

service identifier, receiving at the word processor, by a first server process, the HTTP GET request call and parsing the call to retrieve the parameters, and HTTP GET request acknowledgement having a uniform resource locator (URL) of a second server process.

Greco further lacks explicitly teaching

However HTTP teaches an HTTP GET request...(see claim 6). Therefore it would've been obvious to modify Greco with HTTP, providing the benefit of utilizing a standard protocol for retrieving the necessary parameters, and URL for a translator, for translating a word-processed document by an online translation service provider, via the Internet.

Greco and HTTP lack explicitly teaching saving a pre-translated document including non-text entries and formatting as an HTML formatted document, the HTML formatted document including tags for the formatting of the pre-translated document and tags linking the HTML formatted document to non-text entries in the pre-translated document, *instead of the HTML formatted document including the non-text entries*;

However, Lissauer teaches the lacking elements, saving...instead of the document including the non-text entries. (C.4.lines 15-29-"it only stores the path ..."). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been

obvious to modify the combination of HTTP with Greco stored document by storing only the paths to non-text entries. The motivation for doing so would have been to save memory space.

The combination of Greco and Lissauer and HTTP does not teach saving the pre-translated document as an HTML document. However, the Examiner takes official notice that having HTML as a method for marking a language for transmission over the Internet was well known at the time of the invention (Microsoft Word 2000 contains "Save As HTML" option). Bourbonnais teaches translation services requiring HTML formatting of document for translation (C.7 lines 15-30-his supported formats for translation as HTML). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of HTTP with Greco and Lissauer with Bourbannais' requested HTML format having a saved document as a HTML formatted document for translation and presentation/display to the user, providing the benefit of a known format for electronic online document transmission for translation and reception by an interface/browser.

Greco and Lissauer and Bourbonnais together lack an HTTP POST request call having a plurality of call parameters comprising a remote

service provider identifier, a user interface language identifier, a processing service identifier, and further comprising a data body including the HTML formatted document requiring remote processing, the HTML formatted document requiring processing according to the processing service identifier.

However, HTTP teaches an HTTP POST request having a plurality of call parameters. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Lissauer with Greco's request for online translation with HTTP, providing the benefit of having a well known protocol for posting or providing a block of data (in HTML as required, see claim 10, and necessary parameters for language translation to a translation service, i.e. parameters, including language, service, and data for translation-see claim 10) to an online translation service.

As per **claim 13**, Greco, HTTP, and Lissauer make obvious the method of claim 12, and Greco further discloses wherein:

the remote processing service provider identifier includes a translation service identifier (C.9 lines 19-25-his translation from a language to another inherently requires an service identifier) ;

the processing service identifier includes a "from" language identifier and a "to" language identifier (ibid); and

a document translated from the “from” language to the “to” language (ibid).

Greco, HTTP, Lissauer lacks explicitly teaching the processed HTML document includes the HTML formatted document translated from the "from" language to the "to" language.

However, Bourbonnais teaches a processed HTML document including the HTML formatted document translated from the “from” language to the “to” language (C.7 line 23-30-HTML formatted document from one language to another, inherently requiring a from and to language). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify the combination of Greco, HTTP, and Lissauer with Bourbonnais' HTML processed document, providing the benefit of having an HTML processed and translated document.

6. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greco in view of Lissauer and further in view of Bourbonnais, in view of Hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP, HTTP-1.0, 1996), and further in view of Reisman (US 7,062,561).

As per **claim 14**, claim 14 sets forth similar limitations to claims 10 and 12 and is this rejected for the same reasons and under the same rationale as discussed below, Greco, Lissauer and Bourbonnais make obvious a system for submitting an originally-formatted document to a remote translation service, comprising:

to save as HTML an original non-HTML document requiring translation from a first language to a second language, such that non-text entries and formatting of the original document are saved to a temporary storage medium (see claims 10 or 12), and such that the saved document includes paths to the non-text entries and formatting of the original document saved to the temporary storage medium (see claims 10 or 12);

to launch an instance of an Internet browser module (see claims 10 or 12):

an Internet browser module operative (see claim 10 or 12),

to receive the saved document from the word processing module (see claims 10 or 12);

to send the saved document to a remote translation server via a distributed computing environment (see claim 12);

to receive a translation of the saved document from the remote translation server (see claim 10 or 12);

to display the translation of the saved document, including a display of the non-text entries and formatting from the original document in the translation of the saved document (see claims 10 or 12) ; and

the remote translation server operative,

to receive from the Internet browser module the saved document (see claim 10)

to translate the saved document (see claim 10); and

to return the translation of the saved document to the Internet browser module (see claim 10),

the above combination lacks teaching a word processing module operative to request from a redirection server a URL of a translation server;

to receive from the redirection server the URL;

However, Reisman teaches a word processing module operative to request from a redirection server a URL of a server (C.6.lines 35-40, abstract);

to receive from the redirection server the URL (ibid). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify the combination

of Greco, Lissaur, HTTP, and Bourbonnais with Reisman's redirection server, providing the benefit of a server that upon entry by the user that provides a URL that can accommodate the specific interest of the user (see Reisman abstract, i.e. translation server/url).

As per **claim 15**, Greco, Lissaur, HTTP, and Bourbonnais with Reisman's make obvious claim 14,

Greco, Lissaur, HTTP, and Bourbonnais lack teaching wherein: the redirection server is operative,

to receive service and language parameters from the word processing module; and

to return the identification of the remote translation server to the word processing module.

However, Reisman teaches a receive parameters and to return the identification of the remote server (see claim 14). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify the combination of Greco, Lissaur, HTTP, and Bourbonnais with Reisman's redirection server, providing the benefit of a server utilizes entry parameters necessary for online translation, and provides identification of a related server (translation

server), thus providing a URL that can accommodate the specific interest of the user (see Reisman abstract, i.e. translation server/url).

As per **claims 16**, Greco, Lissaur, HTTP, and Bourbonnais with Reisman's claim 14, and Greco further teaches the word processing module is further operative

to retrieve a list of translation services from an operating system registry (see claim 1); and

to display the list of translation services (see claim 1).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Pan et al. (US 7,058,626) teaches a redirection server that can redirect directly to an appropriate translation engine.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571/272-7603.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

lms
9/23/07

PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER